

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

August 7, 2002

Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

VOTING MEMBERS

Barry Combs, Chandler	Keith Kesti, Peoria
* Mark Weiner, Gilbert	Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Pat Thurman, Glendale	* Troy Hayes, Phoenix (Water)
David Ramirez, Goodyear	Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Ted Collins, MCDOT	Brian Pirooz, Surprise
Steven Borst, MCESD	James Bond, Tempe
Doug Davis, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

* James Pulice, Jr., AGC	* Tom Domizi, UTCA
Brian Gallimore for Jim Grose, AGC	Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering
Paul Nebeker, UTCA	Baird Fullerton for Sean Goris, ACEA
* Jeff Benedict, ARPA	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

GUESTS/VISITORS

John Ashley, Arizona Cement Association
Corey Welch of Nyloplast
Mark Kastl, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.
Mark Moiller, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.
Dale Phelan, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.
Matthew Childs, American Concrete Pipe Assoc.
Michael Hook, Hanson Pipe & Products
Stew Waller, Rinker Materials
Richard Park, City of Phoenix
Joel Mork, City of Phoenix

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:37 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the minutes from the meeting of July 3, 2002. John Ashley noted that in Item 6. a., Paul Mueller is formerly from PCA. PCA does not have an office in the Phoenix area. Ted Collins introduced a motion for a vote on the minutes with the above exception. David Ramirez seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2001 Carry Over Cases:

- a. **Case 01-07 - Sections 750 & 630 - Various Water Changes:** Rod Ramos has not been contacted by the industry representative and in turn, he has taken no action on the case. Doug Davis did receive the latest AWWA Standards from Jim Grose and it was the same as currently in the Specification. Do to a lack of interest, Rod withdrew the case.
- b. **Case 01-08 - Section 710 - Pavement Replacement:** Rod Ramos has taken no action on the case. The final report for the Evaluation of Pavement Cut Impacts is now circulating to the various members for signatures. Rod would like to hold this case open until the report is fully approved.

4. 2002 Submitted Cases:

- a. **Case 02-03 - Section 321.6 - Corrective Requirement for Deficient Asphalt:** Joe Phillips provided to the committee a copy of the previously submitted case dated January 29, 2002 with hand written revisions. This submittal was re-dated August 7, 2002. The hand written revisions represents the latest consensus of comments received from the various interested parties. Joe provided a brief overview of the most recent handwritten changes as well as the original case.
- b. **Case 02-04 - Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete:** Joe Phillips provided to the committee a copy of the previously submitted case dated January 29, 2002 with hand written and typed insert revisions. The hand written and typed inserted revisions were re-dated August 7, 2002. The revision represents the latest summary of comments received from the various interested parties. From the January 29, 2002 draft, Joe made four changes: 1) Word changes in Section 710.4.3; 2) (Insert ①) Revised table for Laboratory Voids Acceptance/Penalties and the criteria for the related testing; 3) Require a certified laboratory for the quality control in Section 710.5.1; and 4) (Insert ②) Revised the table for Allowable Gradation.
- c. **Case 02-05 - Section 711 - Paving Asphalt:** Joe Phillips received some comments regarding this case. However, he elected to keep the case dated February 6, 2002 as it stands. The one major comment was to reference MP1 for the various grades of asphalt. Joe felt that selecting only four types of asphalt as specified in the case will provide the agencies better control of the asphalt provided by the industry.
- d. **Case 02-06 - Miscellaneous Corrections:** There were no discussion or comments regarding the four current miscellaneous changes in the case.
- e. **Case 02-11 - Section 340.1 - Expansion Joints:** The revisions, planned to be provided in last months meeting by Barry Combs, did not develop. On further checking by Barry, the expansion joint placement was a verbal criteria and not a written criteria as first though. Jeff VanSike provided Doug Davis with written comments from the City of

Phoenix. Doug will review the comments and incorporate them in the case.

- f. **Case 02-12 - Section 107.6.1 - Contractor's Marshaling Yard:** Based on the comments provided by the committee in the last meeting, Doug Davis revised the case. The two major changes were the 1) addition of the subcontractors and 2) the requirement of the permit holder in non-agency projects to collect and retain all documentation. Since the mailing of the packet to the members, Doug had two additional minor word changes. Doug provided a copy of the latest case to the members. Brian Pirooz noted that the spelling of Marshaling yard was incorrect in paragraph G. After a short discussion, Doug Davis introduced a motion for a vote on Case 02-12 dated July 31, 2002 with the one spelling correction. Jeff VanSike seconded the motion. The case passed with a vote of 9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained and 1 temporally absent (Goodyear).
- g. **Case 02-13 - Section 603.1.2 and 738.1.2 - Water Stops:** Doug Davis revised this case from the original submittal. The copy of the revised wording was provided in the monthly packet and was dated July 8, 2002. The revised wording placed the water stops following the rubber gaskets in each of Sections 615, 618 and 738. This will make the water stops more noticeable and in a location with similar materials.
- h. **Case 02-14 - Section 738.1 - Third Party Certification for HDPE:** There was a short discussion regarding third party certifications. The question to the sales representative was the benefit that the third party will provide over the present specification.
- i. **Case 02-15 - Section 603.3.2 - HDPE Trench Width:** There was a general discussion regarding the type of backfill material in the pipe zone (flowable or non-flowable) in relationship to the distance between the pipe and the wall of the trench at the spring line. Also, the internal strength of the various type of pipes was discussed in relationship to the type of compaction in the pipe zone. Since this case generated considerable discussion, Rod Ramos will revise the wording of the case. During the discussion, issues regarding case 02-17 were also covered. Rod noted that the two cases were similar in nature. Jeff Van Skike provided Rod with written comments from the City of Phoenix on the HDPE Cases.
- j. **Case 02-16 - Section 603.5.5 - Affidavit of Installation:** In answer to a question presented to the manufacturer's representatives, the manufacturer's representatives stated that he did not want to be required to certify the installation of the pipe and noted the inconsistencies in the current Specification for certifications of the various types of pipe. Also, he did not want to be responsible for the certification of the entire project when all he witnessed was the last days of installation. Doug Davis did not agree with the deletion of the certification but could support a case that will provide uniformity in the specifications. The requirement for the certification could be at the discretion of the Engineer and will be required at the beginning of the project. Once the contractor's operation has been certified by the manufacturer, it will be the responsibility of the contractor to maintain quality control throughout the project.
- k. **Case 02-17 - Section 601.1 - Minimum Trench Width:** Since this case is closely related to case 02-15 above, see comments in case 02-15.
- l. **Case 02-18 - Section 601.4.2 - Bedding by Water Consolidation:** Several of the

committee members became confused as to the water settling of the entire trench at 8-inch lifts. The manufacturer's representative informed the committee that the lifts were required below the top of the pipe. Rod Ramos will rework the case to improve the wording

- m. **Case 02-19 - Detail 541 - Catch Basin - Type G:** Corey Welch, manufacturer's representative, provides a packet of material to each member explaining the use of the HDPE catch basins. There was a short discussion regarding the use of the catch basins in the right of way.
- n. **Case 02-20 - Section 601.2.2.1 - Center Clearance of Multiple Pipes:** No discussion was recorded on this case.

5. General Discussion:

- a. Doug Davis presented and discussed two new miscellaneous corrections cases. Copies of both cases were provided in the meeting. The first case (02-06E) pertained to changes the ARS numbers in MAG Section 109.6. Several years ago, the legislature changes the location of a number of laws. This was one of them. Paul Ward provided a handout of all ARS numbers referenced in the MAG Specifications and if each number correlates with each other. Doug Davis stated that this may be a good case for next year. The second case (02-06F) was an omission of the decimal point in the title of Subsection 336.2.4.1.
- b. John Ashley provided an update on the ADA's requirement for truncated domes. In a discussion with the represent on the ACC Board in Washington, John was informed that the domes were essentially approved by the board. Regarding the 10 minute audience that Paul Mueller obtained with the board, John believes that if a member from one of the agencies would attend, it would have a more significant impact than Paul who is not presently part of any association or organization. Also, any letters to the Board would have better impact if written by an agency. After some discussion, Paul Ward will check with his staff and see if a letter could be drafted by MAG and sent collectively. If he obtains approval, Paul will get with John to insure that all of the issues are covered. Barry Combs informed the committee that the City of Chandler has installed a couple of truncated dome ramps at the southeast corner of Ray Road and Arizona Avenue.
- c. Richard Park address the committee regard uniformity of AutoCAD drawings throughout the metropolitan area. This will apply to all types of drawings that an agency will come in contact with, e.g., Standard Details, Agency's Supplemental Details, Plats, Subdivision and Individual Improvement plans, Contract Project Plans, etc. If everyone in the area would use the same system, the information can be shared quite easy. Richard provides a hand out of how this can be accomplished. Doug Davis informed Richard, that his idea was a good one but he was addressing a construction committee who normally does not cover this type of subject matter. A special committee could be formed to address this subject. It could function similar to the Street Naming and Addressing Committee. Paul Ward will check into the records of the Street Naming Committee to see how it was formed and operated. This committee can contact the appropriate person within each of their agencies for participation in the proposed committee.

7. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p. m.